DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 999 SP 005 366

AUTHOR	Augenstein, Mildred B.; Tennis, Melvin H., Jr.
TITLE	Concentrated Placement of Student Teachers.
INSTITUTION	Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Gainesville.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	37p.
AVAILABLE FROM	J.B. White, Fla. Educational Research & Development Council, College of Education, Univ. of Fla., Gainesville, Fla. 32601 (single copy $1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Affiliated Schools; *College School Cooperation; Preservice Education; *Student Teachers; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Placement
IDENTIFIERS	*Student Teaching Centers

ABSTRACT

During the 1968-69 school year the Dade County, Florida, Public Schools conducted an experiment in which student teachers were placed in concentrated numbers among selected schools. The program involved 15 elementary and secondary schools as experimental student-teaching centers into which 212 student teachers were placed from the University of Miami and Florida Atlantic University. The remaining group of approximately 400 student teachers from these two universities were placed according to conventional procedures and served as a comparison group. Data for the study were gathered through two procedures: 1) questionnaires distributed to student teachers in experimental and comparison schools and to supervising teachers and administrators in experimental schools, and 2) on-site interviews based on a structured questionnaire form. Analysis of the questionnaires indicated that student teachers did benefit from concentrated placement; that cooperating personnel in experimental schools generally favored the program, although there were some instances of dissatisfaction, especially in secondary schools; and that the program did not cause any significant increase in inservice activities in the schools involved. Conclusions are that concentrated placement is a feasible and beneficial method, but flexible formats suited to local conditions should be explored. (An appendix contains copies of the questionnaires.) (RT)

RESEARCH BULLETIN

CONCENTRATED PLACEMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Study of the 1968-69 Program for the Concentrated Placement of Student Teachers in the Dade County Public Schools

by

MILDRED B. AUGENSTEIN
Coordinator, Staff Development

MELVIN H. TENNIS, JR.
Consultant, Research Methods
Dade County Public Schools
Miami, Florida

Published by
THE FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

Published Quarterly

Annual Subscription $3.00
Individual Copies $1.00
(10% discount for 5 or more)

Copies may be secured from J. B. White, Executive Secretary, Florida Educational Research and Development Council, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601

ED055999

PREFACE

Colleges, Departments of Education and cooperating public schools face constantly the question of whether or not student teachers should be concentrated in a small number of centers or dispersed widely throughout the school system. This study was conducted in Dade County by Mildred Augustine and Melvin Tennis with the cooperation of the University of Miami and Florida Atlantic University. It attempts to answer, in part, some of the questions that educators raise about this issue. Florida Atlantic University concentrated their placement in two elementary schools, but since control groups were not set up for these two schools, the details of their findings are not reported in this study. It is important, however, to understand that the student teachers and the faculties of the two schools cooperating with Florida Atlantic University were highly pleased with this experiment. This study reports the contrasting information between the experimental and control schools in Dade County of students from the University of Miami. The research phase of this study was supported by the Florida Educational Research and Development Council. We are indebted to Mrs. Mildred Augustine and Mr. Melvin Tennis for preparing this report which is published as one of the Research Bulletins.

J. B. White, Executive Secretary

March, 1971

ED055999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background 3

Design of the Study 6

Results of the Study 7

Conclusions and Applications 26

Appendix: 29

CONCENTRATED PLACEMENT
OF
STUDENT TEACHERS

BACKGROUND

Student teaching is defined as the period of the pre-service preparation of teachers during which the college student, who is working under the guidance of a supervising teacher in an approved situation, takes increasing responsibility for the work of a given group of learners over a period of consecutive weeks, culminating in a period of total responsibility. (1)

While the student teaching or internship experience is found as a fairly universal component of teacher education programs today, agreement is far from universal as to the form this experience should take. Programs differ considerably in duration, in sequence of courses, in requirements and content, and in conditions for training. Satisfaction with the outcome of student teaching programs is likewise varied. Impetus for change and improvement of programs is widespread. This trend coincides with the general movement within the profession for more effective development of educational personnel at all levels.

Among various approaches for modifying student teaching programs is the organization of programs around "student-teaching centers." A student-teaching center has been described as "a public or private school with which an agreement has been reached providing for the placement of student-teachers in concentrated numbers." (2)

In a recent national survey of 1,110 student-teacher programs which produced responses from 847 institutions, 22% or approximately 186, reported placing their student-teachers in centers. (3) However, it is not known how many of these centers were public or private schools nor the number of student-teachers needed to meet the criterion of "concentrated." Little data are available from which to draw conclusions on the relative merits or disadvantages of the concentrated placement programs.

Review of Literature

Though a survey (4) published in 1968 reported use of student-teaching centers in 44 out of 48 states, studies of such centers and their effects are very few. Across the United States 186 institutions of higher learning reported placing their student-teachers in centers, and 25 of these institutions listed the student-teacher center as their main innovation.

Only one study (8) could be found that attempted measuring the effects of a student-teaching center. Young reported that groups of randomly selected center and non-center interns differed significantly on certain scales of *The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.* An analysis of classroom verbal interaction showed that student center teachers lectured less and used and accepted student contributions more frequently, ($P.<.05$). Similarly on Ryans' *Teacher Characteristics' Scale* student center teachers were described as "stimulating and imaginative" and as showing superior verbal understanding. On the Gallagher-Aschner verbal interaction categories the two groups differed to a significant degree. Non-center student teachers employed convergent thinking more often ($P.<.001$) in contrast to student center teachers who more frequently relied upon divergent thinking ($P.<.05$).

In 1966 the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Association for Student Teaching (6) submitted a number of joint school-college teacher training programs to the critical analysis of a workshop-symposium. It was concluded that such school-college relationships "generally provide for the school to assume a higher degree of responsibility and usually includes cooperative planning and supervision of the teacher education program"; that "The limitations and inadequacies of conventional student teaching arrangements, which carry with them divided allegiance and contradiction in purposes, cause the student teaching center to be intriguing as a model institution for the future"; and that "student teaching centers suffer from viewing the laboratory experience phase of teacher education as culminating in a one-to-one relationship of a student teacher, a cooperating teacher, and a class of children. . . . the student teaching center may become a transitional institution moving toward a new structure with new roles, but still with the necessary component of joint venturing with schools and colleges playing cooperative, but varying, roles".

Dorothy Young (7) outlined steps in developing joint programs in teacher education involving student-teaching centers. She described the advantages and disadvantages of such centers to cooperative schools and universities, and listed questions for further study and research.

Metté (5) described how a student-teacher center operated in Long Island, New York. He set forth policies and procedures guiding the administration of the program, concluding that student-teaching centers provide "a more professional program of field preparation for teaching."

Purpose of the Dade County Project

During the 1968-69 school year the Dade County, Florida, Public Schools conducted an experiment in which student teachers were placed in concentrated numbers among selected schools in the system. Dade's program involved fifteen public schools as experimental student-teaching centers into which 212 student teachers were placed from two of the local teacher training institutions, the University of Miami in Coral Gables and Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton. Of the fifteen schools involved eight were elementary schools; five were junior high schools; and two were senior high schools. The public schools were selected by the four district offices which had elected to join the study.

The Dade experiment proceeded in two phases, roughly paralleling the sessions at the two universities. Florida Atlantic University provided student-teachers in two elementary centers during the winter quarter, January 6-March 18, 1969. The University of Miami's participation was during its spring semester, February through May, 1969, at thirteen schools. The Dade School System's Department of Staff Development coordinated the project.

The number of student teachers placed within individual school centers varied. At the elementary level one school had a group of only five student teachers; other elementary schools varied to a high of 18 in one center. Junior high schools had groups of between 13 to 18 student teachers placed in individual centers. The two senior high schools received 20 and 23 student teachers each. The experimental group of 139 represented approximately one-fourth of all student teachers assigned to Dade County Public Schools for the period, the remainder having been

placed according to conventional procedures, one or two to the schools serving as control schools. Since the phase of this study carried out by Florida Atlantic University did not have a control group, this phase is not reported in this bulletin. However, both teachers and student teachers in the two elementary schools working with Florida Atlantic University reported a high degree of satisfaction with the experiments.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The Dade County School Board initiated the experiment with two objectives in view. As its first objective, the school system wished to ascertain whether programs in concentrated centers would prove more stimulating and satisfying for student teachers than experiences gained under conventional arrangements. As its second objective, the School Board was concerned with the effect upon school faculties of concentrating student teacher placement. It sought here to test an assumption that the presence of large numbers of student teachers in a school would affect the number and kind of faculty inservice activities which would occur.

General Design and Collection of Data

The study was designed to uncover differences between the experimental and conventional programs with respect to such processes as planning a student-teacher program, orientation of student-teachers to staff and school policies, supervision of student teachers, adequacy of facilities and availability of supplies and equipment, and attitudes of student-teachers toward their experiences. Advantages and disadvantages of the concentrated program and suggestions for its improvement were solicited from both student-teachers and faculty. Evidence of faculty involvement in inservice activities was sought.

Data for the study were gathered through two procedures: 1) Questionnaires distributed to student teachers in experimental and control schools and to supervising teachers and administrators in experimental schools, and 2) On-site interviews built around a structured questionnaire-observation form.

With the cooperation of university supervisors and school principals, the questionnaires were distributed to student-teachers in concentrated and control schools, and to teachers and

administrators in concentrated schools during May 1969. A total of 400 were sent to students and 200 were sent to staff with returns of 87% and 78%, respectively.

The two questionnaires—one for student teachers and one for teachers and administrators—consisted of multiple choice and free response items designed to elicit attitudes toward student teaching and to obtain information about various processes and outcomes of the experience. The student-teacher questionnaire was distributed to student-teachers in both concentrated and conventional programs, with the provision that concentrated students were to answer two additional items regarding the concentrated program. By changing the wording but retaining the same content, a second questionnaire was designed for teachers and administrators. An additional six items were added to obtain information about specific aspects of the concentrated program as perceived by teachers and administrators. These questionnaires may be seen in the Appendix.

Data were collected from the student-teacher samples shown in Table 1.

On-Site Visitations

The teams of consultants from Dade County's Department of Staff Development visited the concentrated student-teacher centers to meet with various groups of concerned parties such as student teachers, administrators, supervising teachers, and college supervisors. The Questionnaire-Observation Guide which served as the basis of these visits is shown in the Appendix.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

As was previously indicated, the Dade County School System had set two separate, yet interrelated, objectives for the study. The first of these dealt with the educational effect of concentrated placement upon the student teachers themselves, and the second sought to examine some aspects of the program on the faculty's own professional development. Although analysis of the data might have been sufficient in relation to these two objectives above, it was decided to examine another factor as well. This third element dealt with the feasibility of concentrated placement and the degree of acceptability shown to the program by professional personnel involved.

TABLE 1

Number of Student Teachers Placed at Different Levels in the Concentrated and Conventional Programs

	Placed in Concentrated Programs						Placed in Conventional Programs							
	El	JHS	SHS	E & JHS	E & SHS	Total	El	JHS	SHS	E & JHS	E & SHS	JH & SHS	Total	Grand Total
Male	1	9	14	1*	1*	26	6	4	12	9*	7*	1	39	65
Female	54	29	23	7*	0	113	119	7	16	24*	4*	2	172	285
Total	55	38	37	8	1	139	125	11	28	33	11	3	211	350

*Student teachers dividing their experience between elementary and secondary assignment, i.e., art, music, etc.

The importance of this added objective is self evident. Student teaching as a program is possible only through the professional good-will and continuous cooperation of educational personnel at both school and university level. A multiplicity of central office personnel, district administrators, school leadership and teaching staff, college administrators and student-teacher supervisors are all immediately involved in the placement, implementation and supervisory tasks of the student teaching program. Unless such persons find a new program at least as feasible and as worthwhile as the traditional approach, further exploration of concentrated placement concept would seem inadvisable.

As a result, it was decided to summarize the findings of the experiment around three key questions relative to the objectives of the program:

Question 1: Did the student teachers in experimental schools benefit from their experience?

Question 2: Did cooperating personnel from the school system and universities find the concentrated placement program acceptable and feasible?

Question 3: Did the concentrated placement of student teachers result in an increase in staff development activities for the school's faculty?

QUESTION 1: *Did the student teachers in experimental schools benefit from their experience?*

CONCLUSION: *Quite clearly student teachers did benefit from concentrated placement.*

The questionnaire administered to the student teachers included a number of items designed to compare the experiences of student teachers in experimental schools with those in control situations. Four of the significant questions were:

Item 4: During your internship, how frequently did you receive aid from the following sources?

Item 5: How frequently did you receive the following kinds of help?

Item 1: To what extent had the school planned a program for your student-teaching experience?

TABLE 2

Frequencies of responses by student-teachers to item 4: "During your internship, how frequently did you receive aid from the following sources?"

	"Never—Sometimes"				"Often—Always"				X^2	P. less than
	Exper.		Control		Exper.		Control			
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
a. Supervising teacher	30	22	55	27	105	78	146	73	1.13	—
b. Other teachers	77	57	140	74	56	43	48	26	9.77	.01
c. Other student teachers	83	63	151	81	48	37	35	19	12.63	.001
d. Principals	106	82	166	87	22	18	23	13	.01	—
e. Pupils	68	53	118	65	60	47	61	35	61.09	.001
f. University supervisor	82	61	123	63	51	39	70	37	.14	—

TABLE 3

Frequency of responses by student teachers to item 5: "How frequently did you receive the following kinds of help?"

	"Never—Sometimes"				"Often—Always"				X^2	P. less than
	Exper.		Control		Exper.		Control			
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
a. Observing other classes	86	63	149	74	50	37	50	26	5.22	.05
b. Applying interaction analysis to own teaching or others'	99	74	126	69	34	26	56	31	1.02	—
c. Informal discussions with fellow student-teachers	53	39	112	58	82	61	80	42	11.54	.001
d. Discussion with supervisor-teacher	47	34	72	36	89	66	125	64	.14	—
e. Discussion with school administrators	110	80	175	88	26	20	23	12	3.62	.10
f. Discussion with other Dade County personnel	125	91	179	97	11	9	4	3	4.82	.05
g. Discussion with University personnel	108	79	162	82	28	21	34	18	.61	—
h. Discussion with pupils	76	55	117	61	60	45	74	39	.95	—
i. Discussion with parents	123	90	173	90	13	10	18	10	.002	—
j. Viewing video tapes of own teaching	133	97	191	100	3	3	00	0	—	—
k. Hearing tape recordings	132	97	188	99	4	3	1	1	—	—

Chief differences between the two groups of student-teachers as indicated by Table 3 were the greater opportunities for informal discussions with fellow student-teachers, for observing other classes, and for discussions with other Dade County personnel. The differences were in favor of student-teachers in the concentrated centers.

Item 14: Would you or would you not recommend that student teachers be placed in concentrated large numbers?

The tables which follow will detail the results obtained:

As shown in Table 2 student teachers in the concentrated placement program received help to a significant degree more often from other teachers, other student teachers, and pupils than did student-teachers in the conventional program. Help from the supervising teacher, university supervisor or principal from which help is traditionally forthcoming in student teaching programs did not differ significantly among the experimental and control groups.

TABLE 4

PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES BY STUDENT-TEACHERS TO ITEM 1: "To what extent had the school planned a program for your student-teaching experience?"

	Exper.		Control		P. less	
Item	F	P_1	F	P_2	P_1—P_2	than
1a. No planned program was evident.	14	.06	31	.13	—.07	—
b. One person on the school's staff was given responsibility for coordinating plans for student-teaching.	18	.11	28	.12	—.01	—
c. Only the supervising teacher seemed to know what was going on; other personnel didn't	8	.05	29	.12	.07	—
d. All staff expressed polite interest in the program but had no factual information.	25	.16	63	.27	—.11	.05
e. Entire staff seemed enthusiastic about training program and were very helpful.	84	.53	83	.35	.18	.01
f. Other	8	.05	1	.00	.05	—

According to Table 4, student teachers in experimental schools were more likely to feel they were part of a planned school program in which the entire school staff were involved and enthusiastic. Control schools had a greater proportion of participants who reported that no planned program was in evidence and more frequently felt that while other staff members showed polite interest they provided no factual information.

The findings of these questionnaire items were further supported by informal discussions with students during the visitation period. Not only did students in the experimental schools show unusual *esprit de corps*, they expressed the belief that they themselves gave and received support from one another. They also frequently reported that schools seemed to go out of the way to structure plans and meetings for them. In a number of schools, moreover, the student teachers were very conscious of the contribution they were making to the school's own goals. Here they were not simply beneficiaries of that school's resources; they were an important part of the manpower team working together toward common ends.

The final item of the student questionnaire which yielded evidence in favor of the experiment was question 14: "Would you or would you not recommend that student teachers be placed in concentrated large numbers?" To this question 80% of the student teachers voted in the affirmative; only 10% were definitely opposed; and the remainder were either undecided or made no response. There was no significant difference among elementary, junior high or senior high student teachers to this question. The narrative comments which accompanied these responses were especially revealing. Of the student teachers who favored continuing the program, more than half the group cited the help they gave to each other as the principal advantage. Mutual reassurance, free exchange of information, and pooling of effort were cited as common advantages among the student teachers in the experimental program. Many student teachers recorded specific experiences which bubbled with enthusiastic regard for the support they received.

In summation, the student teachers perceived the program benefits in three ways: in the frequency of help they received from others and each other, in the varied kinds of help they received, and in structure and planning which characterized the program. The resultant favor they demonstrated for the pro-

gram was especially significant in light of two factors which had been expected to affect the students' attitudes negatively. In many cases, the student teacher's preference for a specific school or location had to be disregarded in order to manage the concentrated placement. Second, the placements resulted in unusually long trips for certain of the students each day, and this exacted a definite hardship for some. Nevertheless, their positive regard was forthcoming.

A. *General Reactions of Teachers and Administrators in the "Concentrated" Schools.*

QUESTION 2: *Did cooperating personnel from the school system and universities find the program acceptable and feasible?*

CONCLUSION: *The reaction to the program was generally favorable, although there were certain evidences of dissatisfaction.*

Only two types of cooperating personnel—the supervising teachers and administrators at school level—were studied through objective instruments: i.e., the Dade County Questionnaires. Consequently, the reactions of college personnel and that of county-district leadership in the school system had to be based upon subjective responses given during interviews, meetings and planning sessions. A second limitation upon the data resulted from the inability to survey the staff in both the experimental and control schools; only teachers and administrators in the concentrated placement program completed questionnaires. Hence certain comparisons with the student teacher populations, experimental and control, were not possible.

From the responses to the school system questionnaire as listed in Table 5, cooperating teachers and administrators in the concentrated schools were as a whole favorable to the experiment with the notable exception of the staffs in the two senior high schools which were involved in the experiment. When asked the question, "Would you or would you not recommend that student teachers in the future be placed in concentrated numbers as was done in Dade County this year?" the combined responses of teachers and administrators in the elementary, junior and senior high school centers was significantly in favor of continuation with 125 responding "Yes", 11 "No", and 20 making no re-

TABLE 5

RESPONSE OF CONCENTRATED PROGAM PERSONNEL TO ITEM #14: "Would you or would you not recommend that student teachers be placed in concentrated large numbers?"

SAMPLES	YES		NO		NO ANSWER		TOTAL	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
TEACHERS								
Elementary	61	84	0	00	11	16	72	100
Junior High	39	100	0	00	0	00	39	100
Senior High	9	34	10	38	7	28	26	100
Total	109	—	10	—	18	—	137	—
ADMINISTRATORS								
Elementary	7	88	0	00	1	12	8	100
Junior High	9	100	0	00	0	00	9	100
Senior High	0	00	1	50	1	50	2	100
Total	16	—	1	—	2	—	19	—

sponse. This was 80% in favor, roughly corresponding to the responses of the student teachers to the analogous item on their questionnaire.

However, the reaction of senior high school staff personnel within the total population did not follow the group tendency of the 27 senior high school persons responding to item #14. Only 9, or one-third were favorable; 11 were definitely opposed; and 7 made no response. The only senior administrator returning a questionnaire voted against continuation. In contrast to this, there were no negative responses cast by any elementary or junior high school persons who participated in the project, although 12 questionnaires were returned with no response to this question. Thus, of 116 of the elementary and junior high school teachers and administrators, 91% were in favor of continuing concentrated placement. The F.A.U. survey at one elementary school supported this trend, with 100% of the cooperating teachers recommending continuation of such a program.

Reactions of Staffs to Planning and Services at Elementary, Junior High and Senior High School Levels

Results of the questionnaire revealed further differences between the staffs' responses at senior high school and at the two lower levels. These dealt with perceptions of how the program for student teachers was planned and operated. Table 6 reveals the first such difference.

While Table 6 clearly indicates that all schools offered a planned program for student teachers, there were marked differences in how responsibility and involvement of staff were perceived. More than two-thirds of the senior high school responses indicated that "one person was given responsibility" whereas, 13% and 21% of the elementary and junior high personnel, respectively, answered in this fashion. However, only 20% of the senior high personnel reported "all staff enthusiastic" as contrasted with 68% at the elementary and 52% at the junior high levels.

TABLE 6

RESPONSES OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL IN CONCENTRATED PROGRAM TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #1: "To what extent did the school plan a program?"

	Elem. Sch.		Jr. H. S.		Sr. H. S.		Total	
Items	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
No planned program	1	01	0	00	0	00	1	01
One person given responsibility	12	13	12	21	17	68	41	23
Only the supervising teacher knowledgeable	2	02	1	02	0	00	3	02
Staff expressed polite interest	8	09	10	17	2	08	20	11
All staff enthusiastic	63	68	30	52	5	20	98	56
Other	7	07	5	08	1	04	13	07
Totals	93	100	58	100	25	100	176	100

TABLE 7

RESPONSES OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL IN CONCENTRATED PROGRAM TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #2: "Did the school orient student-teachers to the staff?"

	Elem. Sch.		Jr. H.S.		Sr. H. S.		Total	
Items	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
2. Did the school orient student-teachers to the staff?								
Yes	74	99	45	100	24	100	143	30
No	1	01	0	00	0	00	1	00
a. Conference with principal	58	20	25	18	14	24	97	20
b. Conference with dept-grade leaders	41	14	25	18	12	21	78	16
c. Meeting with faculty	66	23	33	24	16	28	115	24
d. Conference with group of teachers	44	15	21	15	6	11	71	15
e. Meeting with administrators	15	05	6	04	0	00	21	04
f. Conference with supervisor-teacher	56	20	22	16	8	14	86	18
g. Other	6	02	6	04	1	02	13	03
Totals	286	99	138	99	57	100	481	100

In Table 7 answers to the question, "Did the school orient student-teachers to the staff?", were an overwhelming "yes" with the orientation effected by conferences with principal, grade or department chairman, with directing teachers, and through meetings with the faculty. All three groups ranked faculty meetings first.

81 10

TABLE 8

RESPONSES OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL IN CONCENTRATED PROGRAM TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #3: "Did the school acquaint student-teachers with its policies?"

	Elem. Sch.		Jr. H.S.		Sr. H.S.		Total	
Items	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
3. Did the school acquaint student-teachers with its policies?								
Yes	72	97	46	100	22	96	140	98
No	2	03	0	00	1	45	3	02
a. Conference with principal	49	20	27	19	14	22	90	20
b. Conference with Supervisor-teacher	61	24	33	23	17	27	111	24
c. Referring to published materials	40	16	29	20	16	25	85	19
d. Conference with group of teachers	44	18	21	15	2	03	67	15
e. Discussion with interns	50	20	31	21	12	19	93	20
f. Other	6	02	3	02	2	03	11	02
Totals	250	100	144	100	63	99	457	100

In reply to the question posed in Table 8, again, the schools responded strongly in the affirmative, employing conferences with principal and supervising teacher and school's published materials to that end. Both Tables 7 and 8 reveal that in assuming responsibilities for orienting the student teachers to personnel and policies, all of the school levels perceived and fulfilled a basic commitment. However, response to the next question begins to show differences in how services were rendered during the ongoing process.

To the question, "To the best of your recollection, how fre-

quently did student teachers receive aid from the following sources?", all three groups gave first rank to the directing teacher in the combined "often" plus "always" categories, totaling at least 97% in each group. The university supervisor was second in preference. At the elementary level the principal tied with the university supervisor in providing assistance. Elementary student teachers state they received help from other teachers and other student teachers 54% and 49% of the time respectively; at junior high school the results were 49% for each group. However, senior high school student teachers received help from "other teachers" and "other student teachers" only 26% of the time respectively. Help from pupils likewise differed. At elementary and junior high levels they received help from pupils 45% of the time, but senior high school student teachers received such help from pupils only 25% of the time. Moreover, while the elementary principals rendered help 62% of the time, at junior high they received help from principals 40% of the time, and at senior high school this total was only 11%.

Despite these differences at the three teaching levels, it must be pointed out that the staffs as a whole reported an overwhelmingly positive reaction to this question if the frequency of responses to the "Never" category is to be used as an indicator. The total responses to this category never exceeded 9% for any aid-giving group. It may be concluded, therefore, that the staff involved in concentrated placement felt that student teachers were helped by a great variety of persons: pupils, teachers, administrators, university personnel, fellow students, even "others" not specified, in this internship experience.

Reactions of Teachers and Administrators to Kinds of Help Provided Student Teachers

Additional indicators of how staff responded to the program of concentrated placement were gained from other questions on the questionnaire. Item #5 dealt with the kinds of learning experiences offered the student teachers. Teachers were asked to respond to the question, "How frequently did student teachers receive the following kinds of help?"

a. Observing other classes
b. Applying interaction analysis to own teaching or others
c. Informal discussions with fellow student teachers
d. Discussion with supervising teacher

e. Discussion with school administrators
f. Discussion with other Dade County personnel
g. Discussion with university or college personnel
h. Discussion with pupils
i. Discussion with parents
j. Viewing video tapes of own teaching
k. Hearing tape recordings of own teaching

As may be expected, the kinds of help most readily available to the student teachers were those techniques and processes traditionally associated with internship programs. Observing other classes plus discussions with fellow student teachers, supervising teachers, school administrators, college personnel and pupils accounted for at least 90% of the combined "Sometimes," "Often" and "Always" categories of the total responses at all three levels combined. However, totals in the other categories of help for the group as a whole were by no means unimpressive. Seventy percent of the student teachers were able to consult with county personnel and with parents "Sometimes" or more often. Interaction analysis, a relatively new process to student teaching programs, was made available at least 73% of the time. Thirty-five percent of the group experienced recordings of their own teaching and 13% of the total group were provided the resource of videotape recording as part of the program. Clearly, the experiences provided covered a broad spectrum of learning opportunities.

Further analysis of the data revealed some differences among the three levels in regard to these learning aids provided. Comparisons of proportions of responses from the three groups of teachers suggest that student teachers in the senior high schools were less likely to observe other classes; to have informal discussions with fellow student teachers, to have discussions with administrators, other Dade County personnel, university or college personnel, and parents; and to view videotapes or hear tape recordings of their own teaching. Those teaching at the junior high level were less likely to have discussions with parents or to hear tape recordings of their own teaching, though "Sometimes" student teachers could view videotapes of their own teaching. However, this latter activity was extremely rare at the elementary level just as it was at the senior high schools.

Final evidence of the reaction by teachers and administrators may be elicited from those questionnaire items which called for

semantic descriptors of the project. More than two-thirds of the teachers rated the adequacy of facilities and space and the availability of supplies, materials, and equipment for the concentrated program as "excellent." The teachers at the three levels tended to choose the same adjectives—"valuable," "stimulating," "interesting," and "satisfying"—to describe the experiences of the student-teachers. In similar vein, the teachers described the help provided to the student teachers as "cooperative," "friendly," "understanding," "objective," "perceptive," and "sympathetic." Thus despite differences noted among the three instructional levels it can be concluded that staff of the schools who were involved in concentrated placement of student teachers reported that they found the program satisfying to themselves and worthwhile for the clients to whom it was directed.

Suggestions by Teachers and Administrators for Improving the Program

One of the potential values of concentrated placement of student teachers lies in the opportunity it affords professionals to cooperatively identify new directions and dimensions for the program offered. A beginning was made toward such ends in the effort of school staffs to identify difficulties encountered by their student teachers and to contribute ideas for overcoming the problems delineated.

One of the paramount questions in the minds of supervising teachers dealt with the area of classroom control and discipline. It is significant that most of the teachers who voted against continuing concentrated placement cited the problem of pupil discipline in their narrative comments. This was likewise reflected in Table 9 where discipline ranked high as a difficulty, especially at the elementary and junior high school levels. When an on site visitation team discussed the issue of classroom management with a group of directing teachers at one of the junior high schools, even those who favored the experimental program questioned the advisability of having their pupils taught by more than two student teachers during a school day. Most of the group conceded the relationship between the other problem factors cited on Table 9—planning, teaching skills, subject area proficiency—and their student teachers' difficulties in classroom control.

Another broad area which concerned staff members in a pro-

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF DIFFICULTIES REPORTED BY TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS IN RESPONSE TO ITEM #9: "What special difficulties did your student teachers encounter?"

	SCHOOLS							
	Elementary		Junior High		Senior High		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1. Pupil Discipline	16	21	11	21	3	10	30	19
2. No answer	15	19	2	04	4	14	21	13
3. No difficulties	12	16	21	41	10	34	43	27
4. Lack of planning	7	09	5	10	3	10	15	10
5. Lack of subject matter knowledge	5	06	2	04	2	07	9	06
6. Lack of teaching skills	8	10	4	08	3	10	15	09
7. Lack of communication with university supervisors	4	05	2	04	2	07	8	05
8. Miscellaneous	10	13	4	08	2	07	16	10
Total	77	99	51	100	29	99	157	99

gram of concentrated placement focused upon the level of communication and services required of cooperating professionals. The college supervisor's general availability, his time spent within the school, his dual responsibilities to student teachers and staff, plus demands in the subjects or levels taught, were seen to require exceptional preparation and skill. In like manner, many of the school professionals showed concern for the level of competency required by the directing teacher's role in student teaching centers, and they questioned whether sufficient numbers of skilled personnel could be provided for such tasks.

In addition to seeking information on difficulties encountered, the questionnaire also sought suggestions from the staff participants on ways to improve the program. This was item #11, "What recommendations would you make to improve the student

teaching program in general?" The free-response suggestions offered by participants have been organized into the following general categories with the frequency count of the type of suggestion shown within the parentheses to the right:

1. Better administration of the program by university personnel is needed. (22)
2. There is need to overcome poor communication in the schools among the university supervisor, directing teacher, and student teacher. (20)
5. Joint planning through regular meetings of university supervisors, directing teachers, and student teachers should be conducted. (9)
4. Student-teaching should include planning with teachers one week before and three weeks after opening of school and should include the closing of school. (13)
7. Change duration of internship. (8)
3. Provide better selection, training, and management procedures of and for directing teachers including inservice courses. (17).
6. Do a better job of assigning student-teachers to schools. (9)
9. Make definite rules for student-teachers to follow regarding attendance, punctuality, and dress. (5)
8. Provide student-teaching earlier in undergraduate program, certainly by or in the junior year. (6)
11. Separate student-teaching and methods course. (2)
10. Relieve student-teachers of university responsibilities while they are assigned to schools. (3)
12. Pay student-teachers at the substitute rate of pay. (1)
13. Eliminate doctoral students as supervisors of student-teachers. (1)
14. Allow student-teachers to know their future assignments and permit them to reject their situations if they wish. (1)
15. Clarify role and duties of college supervisor and directing teacher. (1)
16. Provide better preparation in subject matter for student-teacher. (1)
17. Select supervisors earlier. (1)
18. Assign supervising teacher to one school only. (1)
19. Assign student-teachers in same subject to same school. (1)
20. Provide financial support to directing teachers. (1)

Reactions of University Faculty and Administrators to Concentrated Placement

Because it was not feasible to administer an objective instrument to the university personnel involved in the experiment, responses reported here are, of necessity, drawn from subjective information gained at the planning and evaluation sessions which were held throughout the program. In general, the University leadership cited the following advantages to concentrated placement:

1. College supervisors can use more of their allotted time in profitable activity at school rather than in school-to-school travel.
2. College supervisors can get to know student teachers, directing teachers and administrators better and can find greater acceptance within the school.
3. There is greater opportunity for group planning, observation and evaluation. Decisions are less likely to be unilateral.
4. Changes of assignment when needed can more easily be made within schools.
5. Student teachers can more easily be afforded experience with several class groups or several teachers to broaden their experience.
6. School administrators and other faculty are more involved and concerned with the student teacher program. Plans are more formalized within the school.

On the other hand, a number of difficulties should be noted:

1. Placement of concentrated numbers within one school can sometimes be difficult. A school faculty may not have a sufficient number of experienced, skilled or interested staff to undertake the directing teacher role.
2. Where subject matter specialization is a factor, as in junior or senior high assignments, placement may be especially difficult.
3. The college supervisor may have particular difficulty in defining his role towards various groups of personnel involved, especially when school expectations are not clearly defined.
4. The concentrated internship experience may work a disadvantage against the student teacher's chances for an ultimate teaching job. Spreading student teachers widely

through the system gives them broader exposure to possible employment opportunities.

QUESTION 3: *Did the concentrated placement of student teachers result in an increase in staff development activities for the school's faculty?*

CONCLUSION: *While the large number of student teachers present in a school set up conditions conducive to increased inservice, it did not of itself result in such activities taking place. Schools in the project varied widely in the scope and number of inservice activities generated during the experiment.*

Item #16 of the school system questionnaire to teachers and administrators posed the following question: "As a result of the concentrated placement, were any special programs or services made available for directing teachers in your school to help them function more successfully in their roles?" Of the 150 questionnaires tallied for this item, 55—or more than one-third—either indicated that no programs were provided or the item was blank. From this it would appear that inservice experiences did not automatically emerge from the concentrated placement program. Breaking these figures down by elementary, junior high, and senior high schools indicates that percentages of participation varied considerably at the three educational levels. More than 80% of the elementary teachers gave evidence of inservice activities in their schools; 63% of junior high school staffs in the experiment cited inservice programs; while 18% of the senior high school participants responded affirmatively. Of the 95 persons at all levels who specified staff development programs or services in a free-response manner, reference was made most frequently to four categories of programs: (1) out-of-school visitation with 23 citations, (2) training in interaction analysis provided by the Staff Development Department with 25 citations, (3) in-school meetings, discussions and planning sessions relative to the student teacher program with 22 citations and (4) lectures, seminars or other special input programs provided by university staff, school system consultants or graduate interns with 21 citations. There were two other activities which seemed to be stimulated by the concentrated placement: (1) observation

of different classrooms and teaching situations within the school was cited 15 times, with many of these experiences accompanied by formalized critiquing sessions; (2) and 13 of the citations dealt with team or department planning for curriculum development, new pupil groupings or other instructional changes.

Indications were that the impetus for the inservice programs come from many sources. To the question ". . . from what source(s) did the program originate?" responses showed that stimulus for programs by the school itself with 85 citations was greater than the responses in all the other categories combined. The university has the next greatest source of activities with 41 citations; 16 references were given to the district office, and 20 to the central office. It would therefore appear that where leadership was generated or services made available by school, district, central office or by university personnel to capitalize upon the conditions of concentrated placement, the school could take on the dimensions of a broad-based training center not only for the student teacher but also for the directing teachers or other staff as well. Where the impetus for special inservice activities was not generated, the school program was much like that of conventional situations with the primary focus upon the training of the pre-service student teacher.

CONCLUSIONS AND APPLICATIONS

The cooperative study of the Dade County School System and the University of Miami indicates that concentrated placement of student teachers into specific school centers is in general acceptable, feasible and beneficial to the individuals and institutions concerned. The student teachers find the experience worthwhile, especially insofar as they are offered opportunities for a broader-based learning situation and are enabled to render greater mutual support and aid to one another. Faculty members and administrators in schools where student teachers are placed in large numbers respond with greater attention to school-wide program development which, in turn, is likely to elicit participation from many levels of personnel not ordinarily involved in the internship activities. College personnel feel their time and resources are utilized more efficiently when student teachers are located in a limited number of schools. Clearly the positive results in terms of organizational feasibility and participant satisfaction give impetus to further experimentation in this area.

The study also reveals that much needs to be done in giving definition to the concept of student teacher centers and in developing innovative teacher education programs within these centers worthy of the organizational changes involved. At the most simplistic level, operational definitions of "concentrated placement" and "student-teaching centers" are needed. How many student teachers should a school center be assigned in order to designate its numbers "large" or "concentrated"? How many student teachers at a minimum should be placed within a school of perhaps thirty regular staff, or fifty staff, or one-hundred-fifty? Is there a different allocation rate appropriate for elementary school centers from that which secondary schools can absorb? Are departmental allocations needed in secondary schools, or are over-all school numbers more significant? At what point do numbers of student teachers become too large for efficiency or effective instruction? In short can ratios of student-teaching staff to regular staff be defining factors of student teaching centers in terms of the staff utilization strategies which must be developed to accommodate the numbers of personnel involved?

On the other hand, is it more fruitful to explore the concept of student teaching centers along programmatic lines rather than numerical ones? Does the student teaching center imply significant modifications in the professional learning environment of the school? And are these changes expected to affect in-service personnel as well as the preservice student teacher? If such a definition becomes operational, the focus is less upon numbers and more upon what happens educationally to personnel affected: administrators, regular faculty, paraprofessionals, student teachers—and ultimately the student body itself. Within such a definition the student teaching center ultimately becomes an on-site staff development center encompassing all categories of personnel in a continuum of teacher education.

The Dade County study revealed that neither one of the approaches can be pursued in isolation. Apparently numbers were a significant element in the way a school organized for its student teachers, and numerical factors appear to affect elementary school, junior high and senior high school outcomes differently. But numbers alone did not determine the program of learning experiences which emerged in the centers for student teachers and for their cooperating faculty. Faculty members in designat-

ed centers did not automatically embark in a personal learning adventure just because large numbers of additional college personnel within the school made it more feasible for in-service staff development to take place. Nor did every center sieze the opportunity of the experiment to organize learning experiences for their interns which probed above and beyond those activities traditionally afforded student teachers.

Yet a number of promising developments have taken place since the completion of the 1969 experiment in moving beyond the data previously rendered to find answers to some of the questions posed. In two Dade County schools during the 1970-71 school year student teachers are being trained within a framework of differentiated staffing. Junior year and senior year education students are being utilized as part-time staff members in a structured year-long program which integrates their practical field experience with the theoretical course offerings of their campus study. In another experiment, regular course work and field experience will both take place at the student teaching center, and the interplay of theory and practice will constantly be reinforced. A third program will provide seminars by college professors for both the directing and student teachers at two school centers. Here the emphasis will be upon pinpointing those professional skills which directing teachers must apply and then providing the supervised practice and feedback which will enable the directing teachers to sharpen these identified competencies. In another approach, one college is utilizing the EPDA B-2 Individualized Teacher Education Modules developed by the Florida Department of Education. The student teachers are being trained through these performance-based modules prior to the internship period, and the directing teachers are being introduced to the same technical skills approach so that they may follow-up and extend the process when their student teachers are in the schools. It is expected that the individualized modules will affect changes in the instructional behavior of the student teachers and directing teachers as well.

Improving the education of teachers is a critical concern which the schools and institutions of higher learning share mutually. The 1968-69 experimental program for concentrated placement of student teachers in Dade County Public Schools opened up new avenues by which the school-college partnership in teacher education may be further pursued.

REFERENCES

1. T.E.A.C. Sub-Committee on Student Teaching and Florida State Department of Education, "Guidelines on Student Teaching in Florida;" Tallahassee, Florida; 1966; 4 pages.
2. Metté, H., "Campus Schools and Student-Teaching Centers," Long Island University, Brooklyn, New York; 1968; ERIC # ED 023 641.
3. Johnson, J. A., "A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs: Final Report," Northeren Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois; 1968; ERIC # ED 023 643.
4. Johnson, J. A. "A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs", Monograph II, Multi-State Teacher Education Project, USOE Grant 6-8182, Baltimore, Md., July 1968.
5. Metté, H. "Campus Schools and Student-Teaching Centers", Long Island University, Brooklyn, New York, 1968.
6. Smith, E. B., (Ed.) et als, "Partnership in Teacher Education", American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D. C. ERIC #ED022726, 1968.
7. Young, D. C. "The MAT: New Frontier for School-University Partnerships", a paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, March, 1970, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
8. Young, D. C. "Teacher Education Centers Make a Difference", a paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, March, 1970, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATORS & TEACHERS

A. Please indicate your type of school and position:

( ) Elementary	( ) Junior High	( ) Senior High
( ) Administrator	( ) Teacher	( ) Other _____

B. Other Data:

	( ) Male	( ) Female
Age: ( ) 19-23	( ) 24-28	( ) 29-33
( ) 34-38	( ) 39-43	( ) 44-48
( ) 49-53	( ) 54-58	( ) 59-63

DIRECTIONS: In each of the following questions check one or more of the items that describes the student-teaching program at your school.

QUESTIONS

1. To what extent did the school plan a student-teaching program?
   a. ( ) No planned program was evident.
   b. ( ) One person on the school's staff was given responsibility for coordinating plans for student-teaching.
   c. ( ) Only the supervising teacher seemed to know what was going on; other personnel didn't.
   d. ( ) All staff expressed polite interest in the program but had no factual information.

e. ( ) Entire staff seemed enthusiastic about training program and were very helpful.
f. ( ) Other .....

2. Did the school orient student-teachers to the staff? ( ) Yes ( ) No
If your answer was "yes", how was the orientation provided?
a. ( ) Conference with principal.
b. ( ) Conference with department/grade chairman or team leaders.
c. ( ) Meeting with faculty.
d. ( ) Conference with group of teachers.
e. ( ) Meeting with Dade County administrators (district or county levels).
f. ( ) Conference with supervisor-teacher and university-coordinators.
g. ( ) Other .....

3. Did the school acquaint student-teachers with its policies? ( ) Yes ( ) No
If "yes", How?
a. ( ) Conference with principal.
b. ( ) Conference with supervisor-teacher.
c. ( ) Reading and referring to school's published materials.
d. ( ) Conference with a group of teachers.
e. ( ) Discussion with student-teachers.
f. ( ) Other .....

4. To the best of your recollection, how frequently did student-teachers receive aid from the following sources?

	Never	*Sometimes*	*Often*	*Always*
a. Supervising Teachers	( )	( )	( )	( )
b. Other Teachers	( )	( )	( )	( )
c. Other Student Teachers	( )	( )	( )	( )
d. Principal(s)	( )	( )	( )	( )
e. Pupils	( )	( )	( )	( )
f. University Supervisor	( )	( )	( )	( )
g. Other	( )	( )	( )	( )

5. How frequently did they receive the following kinds of help?

	Never	*Sometimes*	*Often*	*Always*
a. Observing other classes	( )	( )	( )	( )
b. Applying interaction analysis to own teaching or others	( )	( )	( )	( )
c. Informal discussions with fellow student-teachers	( )	( )	( )	( )
d. Discussion with supervisor teacher	( )	( )	( )	( )
e. Discussion with school administrators	( )	( )	( )	( )
f. Discussion with other Dade County personnel	( )	( )	( )	( )

g. Discussion with university or college personnel	( )	( )	( )	( )
h. Discussion with pupils	( )	( )	( )	( )
i. Discussion with parents	( )	( )	( )	( )
j. Viewing videotapes of own teaching	( )	( )	( )	( )
k. Hearing tape recordings of own teaching	( )	( )	( )	( )
l. Other	( )	( )	( )	( )

6. How would you rate the adequacy of facilities and space for making student-teaching a satisfying educational experience at your schools?
( ) Excellent ( ) Fair ( ) Unsatisfactory ( ) Extremely Unpleasant

7. How would you rate the availability of supplies and materials needed for student-teaching in your school?
( ) Always Available ( ) Often Available ( ) Often not Available ( ) Never Available

8. How would you rate the availability of equipment needed for student-teaching in your school.
( ) Always Available ( ) Often Available ( ) Often not Available ( ) Never Available

9. What special difficulties did your student-teachers encounter?

_____

_____

10. What special kinds of benefits did your student-teachers derive?

_____

_____

11. What recommendations would you make to improve the student-teacher program in general?

_____

_____

12. How would you rate the experience of your student-teachers this year? Check the adjectives that seem appropriate.

a. ( ) Disappointing
b. ( ) Satisfying
c. ( ) Frustrating
d. ( ) Exciting
e. ( ) Stimulating
f. ( ) Boring
g. ( ) Anxiety-producing
h. ( ) Interesting
i. ( ) Valuable

13. In general how would you describe the help that was provided to student-teachers from all sources? Please check the five adjectives that most accurately describe the supervision that was provided.

( ) Objective	( ) Domineering	( ) Detached
( ) Cooperative	( ) Insightful	( ) Cold
( ) Friendly	( ) Suspicious	( ) Rigid
( ) Understanding	( ) Demanding	( ) Warm
( ) Awkward	( ) Sympathetic	( ) Perceptive
( ) Aloof	( ) Anxious	( ) Casual

14. (ANSWER ONLY IF YOU WERE INVOLVED WITH THE CONCENTRATED STUDENT-TEACHER PROGRAM THIS YEAR) Would you or would you not recommend that student-teachers in the future be placed in concentrated large numbers as was done in Dade County this year?
Explain:

_____

_____

15. What recommendations would you make for improving the program of concentrated student teaching? Should it continue or not?

_____

_____

16. As result of the concentrated placement, were any special programs or services made available for directing teachers in your school to help them function more successfully in their roles?

_____

_____

17. If your answer to 16 was "yes", from what source(s) did the program originate?

a. ( ) The school itself
b. ( ) The district office
c. ( ) The central office
d. ( ) The university
e. ( ) Other _____

18. Did the program to concentrate student teachers effect particular hardships or disadvantages to any of the following personnel?

	Yes	*No*
a. Student in the school	( )	( )
b. Directing teachers	( )	( )
c. Other teachers	( )	( )
d. Administrators	( )	( )
e. Clerical staff	( )	( )
f. Other _____	( )	( )

19. Did the program to concentrate student teachers effect particular advantages or benefits to any of the following personnel?

	Yes	*No*
a. Students in the school	( )	( )
b. Directing teachers	( )	( )
c. Other teachers	( )	( )
d. Administrators	( )	( )
e. Clerical staff	( )	( )
f. Other _____	( )	( )

20. Were there any indications from parents or other adults in the community that they approved or disapproved the program of concentrated placement of student teachers?

_____

_____

21. Were there any indications from university personnel that they approved or disapproved the program of concentrated placement of student teachers?

_____

_____

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

A. Please indicate the type of school in which you performed your student-teaching.

( ) Elementary ( ) Junior High ( ) Senior High

B. Other Data: ( ) Male ( ) Female

Age: ( ) 19-23 ( ) 24-28 ( ) 29-33
( ) 34-38 ( ) 39-43 ( ) 44-48
( ) 49-53 ( ) 54-58 ( ) 59-63

DIRECTIONS: In each of the following questions check one or more of the items that describes your experiences as a student-teacher this year.

QUESTIONS

1. To what extent had the school planned a program for your student-teaching experience?
   a. ( ) No planned program was evident.
   b. ( ) One person on the school's staff was given responsibility for coordinating plans for student-teaching.
   c. ( ) Only the supervising teacher seemed to know what was going on; other personnel didn't.
   d. ( ) All staff expressed polite interest in the program but had no factual information.
   e. ( ) Entire staff seemed enthusiastic about training program and were very helpful.
   f. ( ) Other .....

2. Did the school orient you to the staff? ( ) Yes ( ) No
   If you answer was "yes", how was the orientation provided?
   a. ( ) Conference with principal.
   b. ( ) Conference with department/grade chairman or team leaders.
   c. ( ) Meeting with faculty.
   d. ( ) Conference with group of teachers.
   e. ( ) Meeting with Dade County administrators (district or county levels).
   f. ( ) Conference with supervisor-teacher and university-coordinators.
   g. ( ) Other .....

3. Did the school acquaint you with its policies? ( ) Yes ( ) No
   If "yes", how were you introduced to the policies?
   a. ( ) Conference with principal.

b. ( ) Conference with supervisor-teacher.
c. ( ) Reading and referring to schools' published materials.
d. ( ) Conference with a group of teachers.
e. ( ) Discussion with fellow interns.
f. ( ) Other .....

4. During your internship, how frequently did you receive aid from the following sources?

	Never	*Sometimes*	*Often*	*Always*
a. Supervising Teachers	( )	( )	( )	( )
b. Other Teachers	( )	( )	( )	( )
c. Other Student Teachers	( )	( )	( )	( )
d. Principal(s)	( )	( )	( )	( )
e. University Supervisor	( )	( )	( )	( )
g. Other	( )	( )	( )	( )

5. How frequently did you receive the following kinds of help?

	Never	*Sometimes*	*Often*	*Always*
a. Observing other classes	( )	( )	( )	( )
b. Applying interaction analysis to own teaching or others	( )	( )	( )	( )
c. Informal discussions with fellow student-teachers	( )	( )	( )	( )
d. Discussion with supervisor teacher	( )	( )	( )	( )
e. Discussion with school administrators	( )	( )	( )	( )
f. Discussion with other Dade County personnel	( )	( )	( )	( )
g. Discussion with university or college personnel	( )	( )	( )	( )
h. Discussion with pupils	( )	( )	( )	( )
i. Discussion with parents	( )	( )	( )	( )
j. Viewing videotapes of own teaching	( )	( )	( )	( )
k. Hearing tape recordings of own teaching	( )	( )	( )	( )
l. Other	( )	( )	( )	( )

6. How would you rate the adequacy of facilities and space for making your student-teaching a satisfying educational experience?
( ) Excellent ( ) Fair ( ) Unsatisfactory ( ) Extremely Unpleasant

7. How would you rate the availability of supplies and materials needed in your teaching?
( ) Always Available ( ) Often Available ( ) Often not Available ( ) Never Available

8. How would you rate the availability of equipment needed in your teaching?
( ) Always Available ( ) Often Available ( ) Often not Available ( ) Never Available

9. What special difficulties did you encounter?

_____

_____

10. What special kinds of benefits did you derive?

_____

_____

11. What recommendations would you make to improve the student-teacher program in general?

_____

_____

12. How would you rate your experience as a student-teacher this year? Check the adjectives that describe your experience.

a. ( ) Disappointing
b. ( ) Satisfying
c. ( ) Frustrating
d. ( ) Exciting
e. ( ) Stimulating
f. ( ) Boring
g. ( ) Anxiety-producing
h. ( ) Interesting
i. ( ) Valuable

13. In general how would you describe the help that you received from all sources? Please check the five adjectives that most accurately describe the supervision that you received.

( ) Objective
( ) Cooperative
( ) Friendly
( ) Understanding
( ) Awkward
( ) Aloof
( ) Domineering
( ) Insightful
( ) Suspicious
( ) Demanding
( ) Sympathetic
( ) Anxious
( ) Detached
( ) Cold
( ) Rigid
( ) Warm
( ) Perceptive
( ) Casual

14. (ANSWER ONLY IF YOU WERE IN THE CONCENTRATED STUDENT-TEACHER PROGRAM THIS YEAR) Would you or would you not recommend that student teachers in the future be placed in concentrated large numbers as was done in Dade County this year? Explain:

_____

_____

15. What recommendations would you make for improving the program of concentrated student teaching? Should it continue or not?

_____

_____

THE FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

Officers
President, Boyd Ayers
Treasurer, Roe M. Martin
Board of Directors, Homer Jones, Anita Harrow, George Douglass, Woodrow Darden, Col. Philip Doyle, James Young, Jennings Rou
Executive Secretary, J. B. White, College of Education, University of Florida Gainesville, Florida
Associate Executive Secretary, William F. Breivogel, College of Education University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida

Members	*Representatives*
Alachua County	Boyd Ayers
Baker County	Alan Harvey, Supt.
Citrus County	Mrs. Orpha J. Brown
Collier County	Homer L. Jones
Columbia County	Silas Pittman, Supt.
Dixie County	Lloyd Jones
Duval County	Dr. Jos. Klock
Escambia County	Woodrow Darden
Flagler County	Hugh Morgan, Jr.
Franklin County	Catherine B. Floyd
Gulf County	Mrs. Laura A. Geddie
Hamilton County	J. L. Dunaway, Supt.
Hernando County	Mrs. Ruth Marsh and John Floyd
Highlands County	George Douglass, Supt.
Hillsborough County	Anita Harrow
Indian River County	Wm. E. George
Lake County	Jennings Rou
Lee County	Hugh Flanders
Levy County	Mrs. Pearle Gibbons
Madison County	T. G. Bishop, Supt.
Manatee County	Col. Philip V. Doyle
Marion County	Dean Kells
Martin County	Dr. Robert Shaffer
Okeechobee County	James A. Young
Palm Beach County	S. Houston Sapp
Pasco County	Horace Allen
Polk County	Roe M. Martin
Putnam County	William N. Odom
St. Johns County	Douglas Hartley, Supt.
St. Lucie County	Charles Richards
Sumter County	Joe R. Strickland
Taylor County	Robbins R. Woodell
Union County	Buren L. Dunavant
Volusia County	Julian E. Markham
Washington County	Al G. Lowe, Supt.
University of Fla.	Bert L. Sharp, Dean

Component Offices

South Fla. Component	Dr. Ward Brunson	Fla. Atlantic Univ.
Mid-Fla. Component	Dr. W. F. Breivogel	Univ. of Fla.
North Fla. Component	Dr. Jeff A. Pyatte	Univ. of W. Fla.

Associate Members
Florida Education Association, Mrs. Molly Sample
Indian River Regional Educational Development Council, Dr. Richard Stewart, Vero Beach
Columbia Regional Education Service Center, Robert Martin, Lake City
North Fla. Joint Consultive Service Center, Thomas Warren, Jasper
Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative, W. Lester Kitching, Chipley

Consultants
State Department of Education, Mitchell Wade
State Department of Education, Division of Superintendents, Ray Tipton